

United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Categorical Exclusion Not Established By Statute

DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2015-0189-CX

June 2015

Film Permit UTU-91207

Locations:

SLM,

Hell's Revenge

T. 25 S., R. 21 E., sec. 25, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

T. 25 S., R. 22 E., sec. 30 & 31.

T. 26 S., R. 22 E., sec. 5 & 6.

North 40 Trail

T. 25 S., R. 20 E., sec. 1.

Applicant/Address:

Jacques Cardoze

2000 M Street NW, Suite 320

Washington, D.C. 20036

202-412-5022

Bureau of Land Management

Moab Field Office

82 East Dogwood

Moab, Utah 84532

435-259-2100

FAX 435-259-2158



**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION FORMAT WHEN USING CATEGORICAL
EXCLUSIONS NOT ESTABLISHED BY STATUTE**

A. Background

BLM Office: Moab Field Office
Serial Case File No: UTU-91207
Proposed Action Title/Type: Film Permit – motion photography

Locations of Proposed Action:

SLM,
Hell's Revenge
T. 25 S., R. 21 E., sec. 25, SE¼SE¼.
T. 25 S., R. 22 E., sec. 30 & 31.
T. 26 S., R. 22 E., sec. 5 & 6.

North 40 Trail
T. 25 S., R. 20 E., sec. 1.

Description of Proposed Action:

On June 1, 2015, Fabien Ortiz, on behalf of Jacques Cardoze, filed film permit application UTU-91207 to do motion photography to be used in a French news feature story. Filming would take place on a motorized route (Hell's Revenge) accompanied by SRP holder Dan Mick's Jeep Tours and a mountain biking trail (North 40) accompanied by SRP holder Western Spirit Cycling Adventures in Grand County, BLM land within the Moab Field Office. Filming would be done using a hand-held camera and tripod. The 1-day photo shoot would occur on June 20, 2015. There would be 2 people on the crew and 1 vehicle involved in the project. All vehicles and mountain bicycles would remain on designated roads/pull-outs/parking areas.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Moab Field Office RMP, Approved October 2008

This is shown on page 65 of the plan and reads as follows: "Meet public needs for use authorizations such as rights-of-way, alternative energy sources, and permits while minimizing adverse impacts to resource values."

Monticello Field Office RMP, Approved November 17, 2008

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s): LAR-6 which states: "Filming permit authorizations are subject to Public Law 106-206. Applications for filming permits in the Monticello PA will be limited to existing highways, roads, and pullouts and previously disturbed or cleared areas throughout the Field Office (including Valley of the Gods, Moki Dugway, Highway 211, Newspaper Rock, and Highway 95) and will have to meet the . . . criteria of minimal impact to be approved without any NEPA analysis."

C. Compliance with NEPA

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.5(E) 19. This reference states "issuance of short-term (3 years or less) rights-of-way or land use authorizations...where the proposal includes rehabilitation to restore the land to its natural or original condition."

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR Part 46.215 applies.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____


Beth Ransel, Field Manager

Date: _____

6/4/15

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact

Judie Chrobak-Cox
Moab Field Office
82 E. Dogwood
Moab, Utah 84532
435-259-2122

The following BLM Specialists have reviewed the proposed action and have determined that none of the 12 exceptions below apply to this project:

Name	Title	Critical Element(s)
Ann Marie Aubry	Hydrologist	Air Quality, Water Quality, Floodplains, Wetlands/Riparian Zones
Jordan Davis	Range Mgmt. Specialist	Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds
Dave Williams	Range Mgmt. Specialist	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Animal Species, Migratory Birds
Katie Stevens	Rec. Planner	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Wilderness, Environmental Justice
Jared Lundell	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Native American Religious Concerns
David Pals	Geologist	Wastes (hazardous or solid)
Judie Chrobak-Cox	Lead Visitor Services Information Assistant	Lead Preparer

Lead Preparer: _____



Date: _____

6-3-15

Exceptions to Categorical Exclusion Documentation

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply.

Extraordinary Circumstances		
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The proposed filming project is not likely to result in significant impacts to public health or safety. To keep impacts to a minimum and not impair public health or safety, the applicant would obtain, maintain and abide by all relevant Federal, state and local government requirements.
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: Conformance with the Land Use Plan and Categorical Exclusion Review Records has been completed indicating none of the above concerns are present in the described locations and that significant impacts are not anticipated as a result of the proposed filming activity.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102 (2) (E)].		
Yes	No X	Rationale: As described, the proposed action is categorically excluded under 11.5E (19). Categorically excluded actions generally have very predictable consequences well established as insignificant and, therefore, would not create environmental effects that would generate controversy or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. No controversial effects or conflicts have been identified with this filming project.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The proposed project would not result in uncertain or unknown environmental risks.
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principal about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The proposed project is not connected to another action and would not set a precedent for future actions that would normally require environmental analysis.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: Filming in the requested locations would not have a direct relationship to other actions that would create cumulatively significant environmental effects.
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The nature of the proposed action is such that no impact can be expected on significant cultural resources.
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or		

Extraordinary Circumstances		
Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The filming project would not have impacts of this kind.
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The applicant would be required to maintain and abide by all relevant Federal, state and local laws throughout the term of the permit.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The proposed filming project would not have an adverse effect on low income or minority populations.
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).		
Yes	No X	Rationale: There are no known Indian ceremonial or sacred sites within the proposed locations.
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).		
Yes	No X	Rationale: The proposed filming project should not result in introduction or spread of noxious weeds.

Attachments:
Categorical Exclusion Review Record
Maps


Categorical Exclusion Review Record
Film Permit UTU-91207
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2015-0189-CX
Jacques Cardoze

The following elements are not present in the Moab Field Office and have been removed from the checklist:
 Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Wild Horses and Burros.

Resource	Yes/No*	Assigned Specialist Signature	Date
Air Quality	No	Am Arby	6-2-15
Floodplains	No	Am Arby	6-2-15
Water Quality (drinking or ground)	No	Am Arby	6-2-15
Wetlands / Riparian Zones	No	Am Arby	6-2-15
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	No	K Stevens	6-2-15
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No	K Stevens	6-2-15
Wilderness	No	K Stevens	6-2-15
Native American Religious Concerns	No	D. Miller	6-2-15
Cultural Resources	No	D. Miller	6-2-15
Environmental Justice	No	K Stevens	6-2-15
Wastes (hazardous or solid)	No	J. De	6-2-15
Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Animal Species	No	D. Miller	6/3/15
Migratory Birds	No	D. Miller	6/3/15
Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Plant Species	No	D. Miller	6/2/15
Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds	No	[Signature]	6/2/15
Other:	No		

*Extraordinary Circumstances apply.

Environmental Coordinator KC Stevens Date: 6/3/15




Hell's Revenge Trail

T. 25 S., R. 21 E., sec. 25, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$
T. 25 S., R. 22 E., within secs. 30 and 31
T. 26 S., R. 22 E., within secs. 5 and 6
Moab 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ' topographic map



● milepost
Land Status
ut_lgd

-



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual use or aggregate use with other data.

Date: 6/3/2015

Approval and Decision

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the Moab Field Office RMP, approved October 2008, and that no further environmental analysis is required.

It is my decision to grant land use permit UTU-91207 to Jacques Cardoze of Washington, D.C. pursuant to the authority of Section 302(b) of P.L. 579, October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1732). The permit will authorize 1 day of filming on public land in Grand County described below and shown on the attached maps:

SLM,

Hell's Revenge

T. 25 S., R. 21 E., sec. 25, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

T. 25 S., R. 22 E., sec. 30 & 31.

T. 26 S., R. 22 E., sec. 5 & 6.

North 40 Trail

T. 25 S., R. 20 E., sec. 1.

Rationale:

The proposal meets the criteria for minimum impact filming in WO Instruction Memorandum 96-148 and the guidelines in 43 CFR 2920.2-2 and is therefore, a full force and effect decision. The proposed action is not in a WSA, wilderness reinventory unit or area with special designation. The proposed action would not result in unnecessary or undue environmental degradation.

This decision shall take effect immediately upon the date it is signed by the Authorized Officer and shall remain in effect while any appeal is pending unless the Interior Board of Land Appeals issues a stay. Any appeal of this decision must follow the procedures set forth in 43 CFR Part 4. Within 30 days of the decision, a notice of appeal must be filed in the office of the Authorized Officer at 82 East Dogwood, Moab, UT 84532. If a statement of reasons for the appeal is not included with the notice, it must be filed with the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of Hearings and Appeals, U.S. Department of the Interior, 801 North Quincy St., Suite 300, Arlington, VA 22203 within 30 days after the notice of appeal is filed with the Authorized Officer. If you wish to file a petition for stay pursuant to 43 CFR Part 4.21(b), the petition for stay should accompany your notice of appeal and shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits,
3. The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted, and
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

If a petition for stay is submitted with the notice of appeal, a copy of the notice of appeal and petition for stay must be served on each party named in the decision from which the appeal is taken, and with the IBLA at the same time it is filed with the Authorized Officer. A copy of the notice of appeal, any statement of reasons, and all pertinent documents must be served on each adverse party named in the decision from which the appeal is taken and on the Office of the Regional Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior, 6201 Federal Building, 125 South State Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84138-1180, not later than 15 days after filing the document with the Authorized Officer and/or IBLA.

Beth Ransel, Field Manager:



Date: 6/4/15